

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are now present in this application.

The specification and claims 1, 5, 6, and 9 have been amended, and claims 10-14 have been presented. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While the originally filed claims should particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention, claim 9 has been amended to place it in better format. It is respectfully requested that the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection should now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over LOBANOFF, U.S. Patent 4,681,366, in view of CHU, U.S. Patent 6,250,967. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over LOBANOFF in view of CHU, and further in view of ZISBLATT, U.S. Patent 3,654,059. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over LOBANOFF and CHU, and further in view of LEWIS, British document 2 264 438. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the LOBANOFF patent, the Fig. 4 arrangement has been utilized by the Examiner. This shows a mirror in a headrest which is flipped down for viewing. However, the cover, mirror and protective unit are all integrally formed with the seat. They are not readily detachable. Thus, it is difficult to clean such an arrangement. The secondary reference to CHU has merely been relied upon for teaching the use of video device in a headrest. No cover is taught by this arrangement.

Independent claim 1 of the present application, on the other hand, provides for a car headrest cover for protecting and beautifying a headrest, and being covered on a headrest having a video device. The headrest cover includes an accommodating space in the headrest. A viewing window is disposed in the headrest corresponding to the position of a video device. A protective unit is disposed in the headrest cover corresponding to a position of the viewing window. The headrest cover and the protective unit are all readily detachable from the headrest. Therefore, these units can be removed for cleaning. Alternatively, if some different color or other design for the headrest is desired, this can be done. Versatility and ready cleanability are provided by the present invention. This arrangement is not found with the LOBANOFF or CHU references.

The dependent claims of the present application further distinguish the instant invention from the utilized prior art. For

example, dependent claims 10 and 14 recite that the headrest cover and protective unit match in color and materials. This will make it difficult for a thief outside the vehicle to recognize the use of a video device in the car headrest. There is no suggestion in the prior art for such a design. Nobody has recognized this antitheft deterrent system.

Dependent claim 11 brings out that a doll in the beautifying unit is readily detachable from the headrest cover. The Examiner has relied upon the secondary reference of LEWIS to show a doll used on the seat. However, this is a one-piece construction. The doll is not readily detachable from the seat. Again, different dolls can be used in order to avoid monotony for the back-seat passenger. This will make it especially entertaining for children. Variations in the beautifying unit are possible which cannot be done in the teachings of the prior art.

The ZISBLATT patent has been noted for teaching an adhesive for a cover. However, this is merely an antimascassar for the protection of beds, sofas and chairs. Such a slipcover, even though it might be used on a chair, does not teach the car headrest cover of the present invention, nor does it lend itself into incorporation of LOBANOFF's device. There is no suggestion in the utilized prior art that you would want to make the units of LOBANOFF readily detachable. It should be noted in Fig. 5 of this

patent that screws and other means are utilized, whereby removal of the protective cover is not readily possible.

Dependent claim 12 also brings out that the beautifying unit is readily detachable from the protective unit. Dependent claim 13 notes that the protective unit is pivotally attached to the headrest cover and attachment means are provided for locking the protective unit in a closed position covering the viewing window. The present specification brings out these different means. The LOBANOFF reference would not teach such closuring means.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art utilized by the Examiner would either suggest or render obvious the car headrest cover of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 35 USC 103 rejections now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Joe McKinney Mundy  
Joe McKinney Mundy, #32, 334

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

KM/asc  
2450-0513P

(Rev. 02/12/2004)